Translated from Spanish to English - www.onlinedoctranslator.com

Masks of pain: an approach to the 'abnormality' of some 'monsters'Slasher[1] in cinema, through the Jungian archetype of the mask (persona) and the definition of abnormality proposed by Michel Foucault.

John Acevedo[2],

A man is less sincere when he speaks on his own. Give him a mask and he will tell you the truth.[3]
— Oscar Wilde

1. INTRODUCTION

In the following pages the purpose is to outline the possible relationships between the archetype of the mask and some 'abnormal' representatives of slasher cinema, answering the question about the The appearance of the mask as a distinctive sign of dangerousness, the discourse of power in the masked person and the social impact of these cinematic iconographies in popular belief, as well as the semantic relationship: abnormal-mask-madness-criminality-dangerousness. The above is based on three theoretical references: Michel Foucault with the course of The Abnormals (1974), concepts of Jungian psychology and some contemporary articles on the emergence of exploitation cinema.

Abnormality has been a major problem for society throughout its history, as it has involved the breaking of the norm, norms that are established from what is knownconsiders “normal” to biological, physioanatomical and behavioral level. In this way, the abnormal is that categorical and subjective assignment towards that which has dysfunctional and irregular conditions with respect to its context and the statistical average (anyone who is above or below that average is abnormal), in other words, normality is a matter that is established through a quantitative model, defining those limits between abnormality and normality is a job that both medicine and the psi disciplines have taken very seriously.

From these previous reflections taken from reading the text The normal and the pathological by Georges Canguilhem (1978) one can perceive the intricate linguistic and meaning relationships between norm, normal, rule, physiological-behavioral normality, and abnormality, but From these previous reflections taken from reading the text*The normal and the pathological*According to Georges Canguilhem (1978), this relationship can be understood from the perspective of language and meaning.

---

[1]The term is an Anglicism derived from the word "slash". A subgenre of horror films and exploitation films.

[2]Psychologist, University of Antioquia, Medellín, 2013 (email: johnacevedoz@hotmail.com)

[3]Original: "Give a man a mask and he'll tell you the truth." Source: Quoted by his grandson Merlin Holland, noted by Angela Bennie in Behind that mask of refinementhttp://www.smh.com.au/articles/2004/09/20/1095651232524.html

of *rule*, *normal*, *ruler*, *physiological-behavioral normality*, and above all how, from the use of labels, the position of another (Institutions, family) appears in a role of observation and judgment of pigeonholing towards what *correct* within a system that aims to maintain a *social homogeneity*.

The issue of the abnormal is not only an epistemic or linguistic problem, it is an entire genealogical structure of biopolitical control, this leads to reviewing the genealogy of abnormality proposed by Foucault in the course of *The abnormal ones* at the Collége de France, where an origin for these figures is proposed, from monstrosity, through the masturbator and ending with the incorrigible, which converge and relate conceptually to make room for the appearance of the abnormal being, who must be treated by specialized institutions in certain corrective or punitive knowledge.

The abnormal, independent of its degree of differentiation with respect to the quantitative model of normality, must carry the label of its *rarity* and what is historically associated with it: *madness, danger, illness, threat, crime*, causing a state of marginalization and therefore as Thomas Szasz (1970) would say, it would sharpen those "problems of life", problems generated around the myth of '*different*', This does not mean in any way that the *abnormal* whether they are harmless or exempt from any charge, since like anyone else they are motivated by their own motives. In any case, judgment decisions should be in the hands of a branch of study that does not simply seek to reform or punish, but to understand in order to improve the life of the individual and his collective, not simply in the hands of popular belief and moral punishment.

In this sense, it is common for these abnormal subjects to use the artifice of the mask to fit into certain standards, so that they can belong to a defined group of people with behaviors considered common, another being *person* (This last term I will explain later). According to Carl Jung (1970), the use of the mask occurs from a "mirror of the world that does not favor us", and would allow some of these abnormal ones to clothe themselves with the "*actor's mask*" to hide their true identity and intentionality, whether instinctive, conscious or unconscious. The link between institutions of psi, judicial and medical knowledge appears as *the mirror*, to try to see behind that mask and give an explanation to that type of behavior, that is, to explain what leads people who seem *normal,* who have had a moral mask to establish themselves in society and who at some point begin to exercise a macabre power where they let their *instinct*.

Linking the above with the topic of the *masked abnormals* (who are both criminal and dangerous), We might initially think that those individuals disturbed by their *life problems*, have jumped the barrier of social immorality and develop other *people* very particular masks. The cinema shows us that they are icons of terror, which hide

something monstrous and deformed, tending towards danger. This has fueled the generalization of the use of the mask, as an element to concealsomething “perverse”, “shameful” and “harmful”, establishing a dam between the victim, the perpetrator and the personal self (individual essence), as well as an actor on stage whose actions are not assigned to the subject behind the mask but to the one who begins to exist when the mask is on him (character).

1.2 Relationship between mask and abnormality.

The word “"mask" from its Spanish morphology and based on the etymology, has possible origins in the*mask*French or*mask*from Italian, possibly its ancestors in Latin (non-classical) are*mascus*,*chew*= “ghost”, and the*maskharah*Arabic = “jester”, “man with a mask”, but from semantic perspectives the concept of mask, not from the form, “mask” can be traced back to more ancient times. In ancient Greece It was called “*prosopos*" thisformed from προς (pros: in front) and ωπος (opos: face),that is, "in front of the face." From there are derived prosopeia, prospography, in relation to the way of portraying a character by describing their features and physical characteristics of the person. This last word, “*Person*" is the Latin appropriation of the same conceptfor the theatre of the time.

According to the twenty-second edition of the RAE dictionary, mask is:

1. f. Figure that represents a human, animal or purely imaginary face, with which a*person*She may cover her face to avoid being recognized, take on the appearance of another person, or practice certain performing or ritual activities.

This same figure in its origins was called in Latin theater as*“person”*of “*character*", curiously with the passageor time this word has come to the point of being confused with “human being”, “personality” and even its meaning has been directed a specific form of legal language, defining the human being as a subject of rights and obligations that are established under the regulations of a human society or community under norms and therefore this subject plays a role in it with a function, where his personality is nothing more than a specific socio-legal profile and his humanity is relegated to the set of norms.

The abnormal, according to Foucault, when he participates in events that transgress social rules, becomes a responsibility of judicial institutions and his condition does not revolve exclusively around moral judgment due to his difference, but is articulated with psychiatric knowledge to inquire into the reasons why these differences trigger criminal acts and in this way judge, correct or punish taking into account the proportion of the act.

illegal-reason. It is well known by popular culture that famous criminals[4]They have used masks when carrying out their warlike, perverse and criminal actions, bank robberies, murders, terrorist acts with the intention of protecting their identities, avoiding capture or incrimination.

The truth is that the mask begins to create a split between the moral self and the criminal-actor self. While criminals satisfy a need or a pleasure from a premeditated impulse, abnormal people do not seem to be directly linked to that relationship, since their genealogy shows them as a construction based on what could not be understood: instinct, biological configurations, social and political intentions of different times. In the case of the abnormal person, who is paradoxically a criminal and a disruption of social rules at the same time, over time he tends to use masks that appear as a response by the abnormal person to a dichotomy, the act of recognizing himself as a different individual (individuating himself, personalizing himself) that is not in line with the system and the need to assume another role to be and do without feeling his original moral self violated. This is the case of the moral monster, the monster-hero or antihero, who seeks to execute his own rules along the way in order to do what he believes from his conscious, unconscious or instinctive belief to be correct without taking into account other social norms.

1.2.1 The archetype*Person (*mask) and individualization of the subject.

The person (in Latin, "mask" of the actor) would represent the archetype of the mask within the conceptualization of the analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung, this author raises in his work*Psychological Types (1994),*written in 1913 but published only in 1921, that there is a phenomenon of split personality, that, although a common individual cannot develop a wide range of these, there can be a single variation and this can be modified according to the environment. He starts from a proverb that says*"angel"In the street, devil in the house"*, to describe the different ways in which the individual behaves according to the time, place and context, in addition to the repetition of these the behavior will become much more habitual, producing a splitting of character and will generate a degree of identification of that self according to each case, closely linked to the idea of*individuation*that Jung raises.

His statements lead him to say that not even a'normal' individualcan be separated from this split because it does not have a real character, a constant personality, that is, man tends to be collective to the extent that his attitudes respond to the general attitudes of the contexts. If he were individual, he would have the same

[4]An example is Ed Gein (1906-1984) "The Butcher of Plainfield", a serial killer who was one of the figures who would inspire several films*slasher*and other works of fiction, and John Wayne Gacy (1942-1994) "the killer clown".

character despite the variety of attitude. In this case of the collective man, Jung proposes that based on the degree of identification of the subject with the environment to which his identification responds, a *person* and describes the phenomenon as follows

> By his more or less complete identification with the attitude adopted in each case he deceives at least others, and often even himself, as regards his real character; he sets himself a *mask*, which he knows corresponds, on the one hand, to his intentions, and, on the other, to the demands and opinions of his environment; and in this sometimes one element predominates and other times the other. To that mask, that is to say, to the attitude adopted *ad hoc*[5], I call her *person.* This term was used to designate the mask worn by theatre actors in ancient times. (Jung, 1994, p. 492)

Basically, the conflict of the Mask is between being/appearing and acceptance/ rejection. Jung adds that behind the mask there is a problem of identity since the internal-external circumstances of the individual do not match, and it becomes evident that there is a problem of lack of authenticity. From the above Jung concludes that "the person is,Therefore, a functional complex that arises for reasons of adaptation or necessary comfort, but which is not identical to the individuality" (ibid., p. 493) and this complex is functional only with the external object and not with the internal subject or object (unconscious). Thus, the mask is used to hide, defend and protect intimacy, whether consciously or unconsciously. The mask is therefore an external personality (attitude), the internal would be the anima (soul) that contains all those human qualities that are missing in the conscious attitude.

When there is a high degree of identity with this *person*, an unconscious identity is created with the soul and in the case where the self is indistinguishable from the mask (*person*), does not become aware of the processes of the unconscious and the ego, therefore, would be identical to those processes. In other words, the one who gets used to the mask is in one way or another destined to carry both his consciousness and his unconsciousness on the surface. His ego will be a product of the desires of his soul, where it will be projected onto a real object, on which it will create a dependency and any reaction of that object will have an immediate effect on the subject, which will attack from the inner flow (inconscious). Jung calls this "tragic connections"

In this line of argument, Murrain Stain (2004) in his work *The map of the soul according to*

[5] *Latin phrase: "for a specific purpose"*

Jung, concludes that the development of the person would have two great dangerous consequences:

1. Over-identification with the person, here the individual has a great concern about being pleasant and part of the social world in which he lives, convincing himself that the image he built of himself is his true personality.
2. The idea of not being in relation with the external world and establishing a link with one's inner life. In this case, the individual is dedicated to satisfying his impulses, desires and fantasies until reaching a level such that he does not pay attention to others. The consequences of this will be his disconnection from others, his thoughtlessness and his "blindness" andHe could only give up these attitudes when forced to do so by the harsh impasses of fate (Stein, 2004, p. 160).

1.2.1.1 The individuation and deformation of the normative subject (a-normal).

According to the notion of the abnormal subject mentioned in previous paragraphs through the discourse of Foucault and Canguilhem, as that individual who is outside the socioeconomic-cultural norm and moves away from the policies of homogenization, it could be connected with the following theoretical proposal by Carl Jung, very close, but not equivalent to the Foucauldian one. Jung makes available, like Foucault, a concept of*Individuation,*which adopts through Schopenhauer and defines it in principle as a process of differentiation, in which the subject tries to form and particularize itself as a being with individual personality, this need is natural, but before this desire there are the norms as a way to prevent the development of this since it must be guided by the collective principles, in other words, the collective unconscious represents in the psyche the archetypes and even more those that represent the human, but this representation is potential and undifferentiated, so that individuation emerges as a conscious process so that all those collective contents can be assimilated with the purpose of appropriating them in a unique way(Jung, 1994, 535).

Jung adds biological prefiguration to his argument by saying that the "individualidentity is already given physically and physiologically and, in correspondence with it, it is also psychologically expresses" (idem) and preventing it is an artificial way of deforming it. It is therefore where this individuation must mediate between the singular and collective character in order not to produce a deformed (abnormal) collectivity. In this game of norms and construction of the individual there is a great conflict where both parties

They must reach an agreement, if this does not happen there will be a failed process of individuation, because the subject should not be willing to accept extreme normativity. The same author He stresses that “a standard is of no usenot at all if it has absolute validity” (ibid., 536) and that the subject in itself cannot establish its own absolute and introjective norms, since this would have a pathological consequence in the environment.

The cohesion between the norms that guide the development of the subject in his community is necessary to orient himself, but these norms, at the same time, should not control all the actions of the individual since "the moreThe stronger the collective normativity of the human being, the greater is his immorality.individual reality” (Ibid., 537). Finally, this individuation coincides with the development of consciousness from this idea of identity exclusivity and therefore implies an expansion of this consciousness in psychic life.

From the other side, Foucault proposes a notion of something also called individuation, but this seeks to singularize and classify the individual in patterns of homogenization to redirect him to models of normativization. Any subject that lives outside of this homogenizing stage of rules and that is found executing his own desires outside of the normal must be repressed, disciplined and corrected, but not only that, but it also shows how the subject is implemented in the versus of the normal and the abnormal. Taking into account an excerpt from a degree work entitled:*Contemporary sexual practices in the genealogy of Foucault's ethical subject* (2009), we can see how the function of the repressive device of individuation is summarized:

> (...) heThe repressive device is maintained in the sense that it is born from there, from that conception of the subject that must be corrected so that he can live in society. It is therefore a question of homogenizing the individual, since those individuals who are not registered in the norm and in society or who go against it become the focus of scrutiny that discourses of normality together with disciplinary apparatuses such as educational institutions, and others such as prison and hospital, seek to re-adapt and correct. (Valencia, 2009, p. 66)

The two concepts of individuation mentioned above: Jungian and Foucauldian, seem to oppose each other epistemically from two extremes, but they allow us to glimpse the game of the mask as a bridge between two realities or positions of the individual, one from the subject and another from the external device; the individual who seeks to be and flow in his own personal needs and the repressive social device that tries to classify these individualities to keep them under control. These beings who do not

respond and that they can be ""dangerous" must be put under observation, analysis and possible punishment.

1.2.2 The abnormal masked as an instinctive monster

All the previous theoretical baggage is a long but necessary prelude to giving it a space and the form that the *masked abnormals* that at the same time are *monstrous morals*, *incorrigible* and dangerous, who from behind their masks seek a projection of their individual desires.

This link between the monster and criminality and its mask to exercise its moral power can be traced back to Foucault's text, *The abnormal ones (2000)* in the class of February 5, 1975. There the author resumes at the beginning the anthropophagic and incestuous origins of the figure that predominated in the first years of criminal psychiatry. These monsters will initially have a great relationship for us with many of the murderers of the most commemorative (bloody) horror films of recent years such as for example *Friday the 13th* (1980) by director Sean S. Cunningham, whose center is the incestuous desire of Jason's mother and her overprotection that ends in tragedy, finally creates a punishing andcharacteristics 'supernaturalis'.

Later in this same class Foucault shows how this crazy criminal appears in the place of the monster. In order not to lose the link with the example of Jason Vorhees in *Friday the 13th*, you can say that Jason is the small and harmless Thumbelina who began being overprotected by a controlling mother in a hostile environment where he was judged for his physical deformity and after drowning he returns as a monstrous entity and this little giant, from whom nobody expected anything, begins to take revenge against the immorality of the subjects who surrounded the surroundings of his home, Jason for example is a fusion of the child who embodies the abnormal little boy, with the moral teachings of a dogmatic mother, somehow Jason swallows the characteristics of his mother and is part of a new monster, "It was the little ones abnormal, the Thumblings, who ended up devouring the great ogres monstrous ones that served as their parents" (Foucault, 2000, p. 107), this new monster wears a mask that unites the two beings.

Elements like those in the previous example are repeated with a certain degree of singularity in films of the same genre, sometimes that being that is not at all exceptional, by a fortuitous act, converges in other *people* monstrous. The class of February 5th *The abnormal ones,* continues with examples of three cases of monsters that found this

criminal psychiatry (The Woman of Sélestat, The Case of Papavoine and Henriette Cornier), the first two inscribed to a rational explanation of their possible motives, hunger, madness, but the third, which is much more curious, is the one that does not have an explanation at first sight, and obeys the classification of *the unreasonable ones*.

Our bloodthirsty characters belong to these categories, they commit crimes that have political, social and legal consequences, and historically, psychiatry appears there to take a bath of power and try to reconstruct the lives of these monsters from their childhoods to take them step by step to what caused their criminal actions, in search of motives. Thus, in order to judge these acts, madness was codified as an illness and later as a danger: schizophrenia, paranoia, psychosis and others.

With its discourse of knowledge-power, psychiatry is exalted as a science capable of observing, analyzing, predicting and deciding from certain signs of illness when a behavior related to madness is therefore dangerous. At that time, its discourse is exalted at the moment when it is able to tell the judicial institution: "At the bottom of any madness, there is the virtuality of a crime" (Foucault, 2000, p 119).

Instinct later appears in legal psychiatry (idem) as a response to motives without reason, since it saw in them a morbid dynamic of instincts and this becomes the central axis for its punitive power discourse to flow. From this moment on, many of these little monsters that begin to appear, circumstantially obey instincts that are latent and that can be premeditated, psychiatry takes the place of a fortune teller of mental illness, to point out possible abnormalities according to their life histories.

2. Slasher Cinema.

"Always make the audience suffer as much as possible."
—Alfred Hitchcock, director[6]

The cinema *Slasher* It is part of the horror subgenres and its main characteristic is that the main antagonist is a psychopath who pursues and kills throughout the film the teenagers who are outside the supervision of adults and generally

[6]Vernet, M. (June 1993). Reminiscences of the Gothic in Classic American Cinema: Aesthetic and Ideological Elements, in Archivos de la Filmoteca 14, pp. 107-117.

when they are perpetuating immoral acts: premature sexual acts or consuming narcotics. The definition of*Slasher*It is a bit complex, but in general, it can be seen from the basic formula that feeds the plot, in this way the films of this type could be divided into two subtypes: one in which the identity of the murderer is known to the spectator, but is hidden from the victims and only allows to be identified through a specific representative symbol (usually a mask) and the second is when the murderer is completely unknown and only until the end of the plot can we know what the identity of the perpetrator is.

Clover (1993), indicates among many other characteristics that are part of the cinematic formula of these films, such as the murderer guided by the desire for revenge towards those who caused a tragedy or humiliation, quick murders without torture, deaths caused by sharp weapons, axes or electric saws, the location of the victims in isolated places with no apparent way of receiving help and the little participation of adults in the development of the story, to this the author He adds that "the police, parents and sheriff only show up for long enoughfor demonstrate their laughable incomprehension and incompetence" (Clover, 1993, p. 44), finally another of the recurring elements is the hero or survivor who is called "final girl" or "the last girl" and is the one who manages to get rid of (not completely)entity) or flee from the killer. For Clover this woman is:

> (...) intelligent, attentive, sensible; the first character to feel some problem and the The only one who deduces from the accumulation of evidence the nature and scope of the threat; in other words, he is the only one whose perspective comes close to our own. privileged understanding of the situation." (Clover, 1993, p. 44)

The figure that interests us then falls specifically on the model of the murderer that the spectator recognizes, but only through his acts and the representation of his mask. A murderer who has apparently unknown motives for perpetuating his activities, and where the mask has a double function, the first is to generate remembrance from a symbolic visual impact, panic and terror from the point of view of the victim and second, to establish a barrier between the personality-emotionality of the murderer and his deadly (criminal) act.

The satisfaction of the entity behind the mask will be to fulfill its instinctive mission of getting rid of the others.*abnormal*or masturbating adolescents, given over to uninhibited pleasure in the absence of authority. The carnal feast begins and their anti-heroism seems to increase as they consummate their moral-punitive ideal. A monster devouring monsters in a sort of fantasy of Saturn devouring his children.

2.2 **Origin of the genre, the birth of the masked monster (Psycho-killers)**[7]

Since its beginnings, cinema has been permeated by the horror genre and until the 1930s, They were nothing more than films of European origin whose themes introduced paranormal and monstrous matters: *Nosferatu* (1922) by FW Murnau, but this tradition was slowly intervening in the film interests of American studios, who, although they had not previously been interested in establishing their own terrifying themes, but in maintaining this gothic and animist style, were already taking their first steps to "spectacularize" this genre, Hollywood then, for the thirties, had a number of non-human characters successfully roaming the screen, *Dracula* (1931), *Frankenstein* (1931), *The Mummy* (1932) and *King Kong* (1933), etc.

David Cerdas (2007) in his research through the history of this genre points out how the Hollywood industry continued to exploit these elements until in the fifties the extraterrestrial monsters and creatures from other worlds became stellar, *War of the Worlds* (1953) and *The Thing from Another World* (1951). Where the idea of the great monster that pursues the protagonist alone changes and becomes massive, the small desolate places are also changed for cornered cities. However, in 1960 the British director based in the United States, Sir Alfred Hitchcock, brought to the big screen a film that would completely change the history of the genre and that would consequently close the doors of classic horror to found modern horror: *Psycho*, and with it the birth of a new type of character that provokes horror, the psychokiller, who takes the place of the abnormal, little Thumbelina who embodies his predecessor monsters.

Movies like *Psychosis* and the subsequent ones were classified as being sexually explicit and extremely violent, despite this they had immediate box office success after collecting, according to the specialized website *The Internet Movie Database*, more than 50 million dollars around the world.

Movies like these gave birth to the *slasher* In which, unlike classic horror, evil here is embodied by the perversity of a person. From this moment on, even darker and more forbidden themes are touched upon, and a prototype is born, the one we all know as psychopaths (*psychokillers*) masked, although deviating from the original strategy of mere psychological terror proposed by Hitchcock. They continue their work in later films with less censorship, more

[7] Hitchcock and "Psycho": the stabbing of classic horror, David Cerdas (2007)

blood and explicit perversity as *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (1974), the saga of *Halloween* started in 1978 and *Friday the 13th* from 1980.

To make the birth of the masked monster in these films more evident, we will take as an example *Halloween* (1978) by director John Carpenter, which would explode during the eighties, representing the origin of the killer movies. stalking: "*Halloween* clearly outlines the figure of the *psycho killer* modern, the merciless punishment of young sinners, (...) the display of violence on the body considered as a scopic attraction, supported by the logic of carnal spectacle." (Sanchez-Biosca, 2001, p.195-196)

But that is not all, it should be noted that these murderers, apparently like the case of Henriette Cornier described by Foucault, are also born under the idea of an inarticulate crime, without reason, presented without any apparent desire or justification that was the driving force of their actions. In reality, we end up not knowing the motive that led to the crime. murderer to commit his 'monstrosity', any explanation would start from later speculations that try to reconstruct the "psychological doublet" that gave him the basis for instinct that pulls the strings of the psychopath's atrocities.

In this subgenre where serial killers are the protagonists, there is a focus on the spectacle of terror, where the only thing that matters is scaring the viewer, creating disgust, establishing states of nervousness and alertness, and this formula is repeated like an incessant cycle in the most contemporary films, *Hostel* (2005) and it is as if the cause of the murders were so obvious that it is unnecessary to name it, since no judge or psychiatrist is needed to leave the evaluation and semantic relationship of instinct, madness, dangerousness and crime to the public's imagination.

The historicity of this genre has no more depth than its mere roots since its chronological synchrony remains a pastiche of women with large breasts and stereotypical beauties in situations of debauchery, where the protagonists do not have a complex psychological construction compared to Hitchcock's Norman Bates, contemporary horror cinema is marked by the cliché of exaggerated morbidity of blood and entrails in repetitive places and apparently anchored to a modifiable heritage in superficial aesthetics, that is, adaptations, recreations or *remakes* as a marketing strategy (the uninterrupted cycle of the masked killer perpetuating predictable acts)

2.3 The masked abnormals of cinema*slasher.*

The*person*The mask, described at length above, is in principle a psychic representation of the subject, but in the following characters, this mask is really a physical symbol, a representative projection of that prefiguration of individual personality placed in a real artifact, built with a rather peculiar intention and materials. The following lines will try in a concise way to explain the genesis or approach those monstrous masks of some iconic characters of exploitation cinema. I will not dwell on superfluous details or on the arguments, but on their masks.

2.3.1 Michael Myers (Halloween: The Beginning) 2007 by director Rob Zombie[8]

Michael Myers, described by the director himself, is the sum of evil at its finest, his completely white mask, without any kind of expression and completely dark eye sockets has been described as the image of a ghost, who in the original installments does not even speak. The childhood of the character described by Rob Zombie is developed in complete solitude, where this character develops another type of identity that is associated with the idea of the development of a double attitude, the psychic mask begins to be present, but it only becomes real at the moment that fateful events on a Halloween day make its appearance. moral killer 'instinct'.

At the age of six he surprises his sister having sex with her boyfriend and waits for the right moment to punish this immoral action of his own sister, by committing this crime he is sent to a mental sanatorium from where he can only leave when he is of age, upon his return he seeks revenge, but it is a moral revenge as a task of the 'beyond', hence his mask generates thatidea of supernaturality, evil incarnated from the perspective of its ritual object.

John Carpenter (2003), screenwriter of the film, points out that his inspiration for the mask was having met a little boy in a psychiatric hospital: “I met this little boy A six-year-old boy with pale skin, no emotion and black eyes; the eyes of the demon [...] what I thought was behind that little one was pure and simple...evil”

[8](See appendix 1) fig. 1 and 2

2.3.2 **Jason Voorhees (Friday the 13th) 1980 directed by Sean S. Cunningham and written by Victor Miller.**

The only thing that is known about Jason's childhood is that he suffered from a significant mental and physical disability, and this fact made him the object of ridicule for other children. His overprotective mother took him on a camping trip, and he drowned in Cristal Lake after being severely humiliated by the other campers.

The hydrocephalus he suffered from caused his head to be deformed, which, combined with his Mongoloid features, made him an easy target for rejection.

His mother is the one who starts the massacre, driven by her guilt and helplessness at not being able to save him and by her position in the face of the indifference of others who only made fun of her son. After her death, His son resurfaces and begins to kill for no apparent reason. In one of the comments on the film, screenwriter Victor Miller adds that the mask unifies the identity of the mother and that of Jason under the desire to kill and punish all those beings who were indifferent to the event for giving free rein to their selfish desires (sex and drugs).

Miller explains that the mask Jason wears is a metaphorical allegory of his physical and mental deficiency, as hockey represents the strength and vitality of teenage players, things that this being lacked and could not live with, as he was relegated to a condition of being different and abnormal. This mask is what reveals a very strong and athletic Jason, which gives a certain degree of symmetry to his monstrous face, hiding his original ugliness and his past.

2.3.3 Leatherface (***The Texas Chain Saw Massacre***) 1974 from director Tobe Hooper

Leatherface is a strong and tall man, he always wears a mask of human skin that he takes from his last victim and thus hides his 'abnormality' the cognitive delay that becomes apparent in his phenotype. This tormented being occupies a place within an anthropophagous and incestuous family, which is constantly perpetuated in both directions.

His objective is to capture and kill young hikers who approach his property. His actions are not premeditated, but arise under the orders of his family, who put into operation the instinctive gear that lives within him. In other words, he is a small, perverse child who hides behind a bloodthirsty monster, hence the origin of his mask.

Gunnar Hansen (2005), the actor who plays his role in the original film, says in an interview:

> The idea of the mask is that there is no real personality under it. That was the idea I had with the producers. They created the character and added the mask so that he could express himself, because he couldn't do it on his own. The character has nothing under the mask, which makes him weak and scared (Robert, I, 2005).

2.3.4 Ghostface (Scream) 1996 by West Craven.

Ghostface is particularly special, as it is a "collective" mask used by different subjects whoThey perpetuate the same actions in a pattern of continuing murder.*Scream*Unlike the previous masked figures, he appears as a fusion of the protagonist*slasher*represented through the mask, but whose identity is completely unknown even to the spectators. The motives for the murders are at the same time of the type of moral punishment for inappropriate actions of the victims.

The film itself is an allegory to other horror films of the same subgenre that preceded it and therefore the symbolic charge of the mask is a meeting of aesthetic icons on the tragicomic of death, the design refers to Edvard Munch's painting: "The Scream", on the cover of Pink Floyd's album "The Wall" and even the cartoonish ghosts of the 1930s.

This mask is perhaps one of the least clear in terms of its meaning and origin, as it is not directly linked to a subject, but to a series of them that have some perverse characteristics in common, they are part of the group of small abnormals that are confused in the common denominator and appear through that mask.

3. Conclusions: The perverse game of the masked man and his way of exercising power.

The*masked abnormals*Those who at the same time have a dangerous and criminal tendency are then beings who have become individualized by assuming their person as an element of introjection, from which they exercise a punitive and moral power. These moral monsters move away from all types of systematization to satisfy a perverse desire and initially set in motion by an anti-heroic idea of punishment for the inadequate practices of their victims, they put on the game board some pieces to which they are subjected.

who judge and execute, ultimately believing that by wiping out their existence they are purging the truth. One might think that these monsters behind their masks have ideals for which they fight, regardless of the social and moral consequences they may have or any regulations they must avoid along the way.

Starting from that order of ideas, it could be said that these beings tormented throughout their history, created a mask in which they found comfort and a goal, that *person*to exercise their power. The type of psychiatric experts that Foucault refers to in his course on*The abnormal ones*could bring his "psychological doublet" to find a response to these ritual acts of death that come from a genesis of suffering, rejection and inadaptability to society, those same acts without reason that gave so much power to psychiatry and establish cause-effect relationships that at the same time have fed the fictions of these cinematographic films of horror, madness and almost supernatural abnormality.

The masked abnormals are ultimately condemned to a superfluous existence, they are dead in life, hence the supernatural allegory on which their being is based, where their judicial and moral person is relegated to a mask devised by their own needs and impulses.

Are these peculiar behaviors, which are not far from real cases, and inspired these masked people, just an aesthetic theme that satisfies a certain morbidity through the screen? Perhaps it is a yes for the exploitation film industry, but for the psychic disciplines, it should be a matter of concern, not to give it explanation or coherence and even less for correction, but for the understanding and internalization of the importance of power discourses, of overexploited images and as a call to think and rethink strategies for prevention and the development of tools that can make these tormented beings not have to resort to masks to be individuals, but can be collectivized without being normalized, nor relegated to the fateful destiny of their abnormal condition. A clue, among many possible ones, is in the postulates on Jung's process of individuation.

References.

Bernades, H. (2007, November 9).*A Problem of Failed Therapy: Halloween 2007*. Page 12. Consulted May 11, 2013, from http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/suplementos/espectaculos/5-8231-2007-11-09.html

Carpenter, J. (Director). (2003)*A Cut Above the Rest (Halloween: 25th Anniversary Edition DVD Special Features*[Film] United States: Anchor Bay Entertainment

Cerdas, D (2007).Hitchcock and "Psycho": the stabbing of classic horror.Essays on the Image II. Edition 2, 14.

Clover, CJ (1993).*Men, Women, and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film.* Google Books. Retrieved May 11, 2013, from http://books.google.com.co/books?id=x4fLaCLD11MC&redir_esc=y

Fischoff, S., Dimopoulos, A., Nguyen, F., Hurry, L. & Gordon, R (2003).*The psychological appeal of your favorite movie monsters*. ISCPubs. Retrieved 11-05-2013

Foucault, M. (2000).*The abnormal: course at the College de France*(1974-1975). Good Aires: Economic Culture Fund.

Jung, C. G. (1994). Psychological types. (Pascual AndrandH.Htonchez, Trad.). Barcelona: Edhasa.

Robert, I. (Writer/Director). (2005)*Return to Quick Hill - The Texas Chainsaw Experience*[[documentary] United States: Home-grown movies.

Rocca, AV (nd). Foucault; 'The Abnormals', a genealogy of the monstrous.*Magazine Philosophical Observations*. Retrieved May 11, 2013, from www.observacionesfilosoficas.net/foucaultlosanormales.htm

Sánchez-Biosca, V. (2001). Dismembering a body: a certain tendency in cinema postmodern terror. In Russo, E. (Ed.). Questions about Hitchcock, Buenos Aires: Ed. Simmurg

Szasz, T. (1973).*The Myth of Mental Illness*/Th. Szasz. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Amorrortu.

Valencia, SV (2009). *Sexuality and contemporary sexual practices in genealogy of Michael Foucault's ethical subject*. [Psychology degree thesis]. University Institution of Envigado, Medellín, Colombia.

Annex I

Michael Myers:

Jason Voorhees:

Leatherface:

Ghostface: